Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is :

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is :

"That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Alienated Villages (Prevention of Tenants and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Alienated Villages (Prevention of Tenants and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE AGRICULTURISTS' RELIEF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953.

Motion to consider.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Agriculturists' Relief (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

This is also a very simple measure. Under the Mysore Agriculturists' Relief Act which was enacted in 1928, it was defined that an agriculturist "shall be taken to mean a person who ordinarily engages in agriculture in the area to which this Regulation applies for the time being, provided that his yearly income from sources other than agriculture does not exceed Rs. 500, and that his aggregate income from all sources does not exceed Rs. 1,000." So, under this Act of 1928, to claim the privilege of an agriculturist, a person's income must not exceed one thousand rupees including his income from sources other than agriculture. As I have already submitted, this Act was passed in the year 1928. It was a slump period. Of late, the prices have increased and the agriculturists are not getting the benefit of this Act. Further, the total income is taken into calculation without considering the expenditure he incurs for cultivating lands, and therefore Government thought that the agriculturists should be given relief by amending the Act. With this object in view, the amending Bill has been brought forward.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Agriculturists' Relief (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration.

2 P.M.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—I want to know whether the Mysore Limitation Act can remain in operation and for how long. That point is not clarified. I think it will expire today and from tomorrow the Limitation Act of the Central Government will come into force and in that case there will be some legal difficulty.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—That we will consider.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This does not refer to limitation. This only refers to income.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—There is the question of limitation because the period of limitation is extended in cases filed by agriculturists.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—May I know whether the Hon'ble Minister has understood me ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He has understood the Hon'ble Member. There

(MR. SPEAKER.)

is a reference to that in the Statement of Objects and Reasons and it must be modified in the Bill itself.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Under Rule 88, this may kindly be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister may make a motion under rule 88.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That under rule 88 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly, further consideration of the Bill may be taken up tomorrow."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That under rule 88 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly, further consideration of the Bill may be taken up tomorrow."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE VILLAGE OFFICES (AMENDMENT) BILL 1953.

Motion to consider.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Sir, I move:

"That the Mysore Village Offices (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

Sir, it has been already stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that section 7 of the Mysore Village Offices Act now in force does not give powers to the Revenue Officers to suspend village officers for misconduct pending enquiry. As Hon'ble Members know very well, in the case of Government servants, if there is a *prima facie* case, they can be kept under suspension. But under section 7 of the Village Offices Act, the village officers cannot be kept under suspension until an enquiry is held by a competent authority. To avoid inconvenience the amending Bill has been brought forward.

1 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Village Offices (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—Sir, this amendment itself *in toto*, I feel, would be unnecessary for the following reasons. Government seek to amend sections 7 and 8 of the Village Offices Act. I will read section 7 (1):

"The Deputy Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner may, of his own motion or on complaint and after enquiry, fine, suspend, dismiss or remove any holder of a village office, whether in an unalienated or alienated village, for misconduct or for neglect of duty or for incapacity or for non-residence such non-residence is permitted by the Deputy Commissioner, or for any other sufficient cause."

I believe that this amendment before us is no improvment at all whatsoever over this particular provision in sub-section (1) of Section 7 because here also it is laid down that the Deputy Commissioner or an Assistant Commissioner may on his motion suspended a village officer for misconduct or for neglect of duty. Probably the fear of the Hon'ble Minister is that there is no scope for the Deputy Commissioner or the Assistant Commissioner for the suspension of a village officer for the so-called *prima facie* misconduct or neglect of duty. This provision in Section 7 (1) is very clear and when there is a complaint against a village officer, for example a shanbhog or a patel, preferred by a private individual or by anybody for that matter, then in such cases there should be an enquiry and after the enquiry the suspension order will have to come to effect. When such is the case, this